

APPENDIX C: Meeting Minutes



McCormick, Taylor & Associates, Inc.

**Route 24 Improvements Project/
Route 54 Improvements Project
Field View
April 21, 2003
9:00 a.m.**

Meeting Minutes

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Gwen Davis	DE SHPO
Ann McCleave	DE SHPO
Maureen Mauger	DelDOT
Sonya LaGrand	DelDOT
Mike Hahn	DelDOT
Patrick Carpenter	DelDOT
Nathanial Delesline	DelDOT
Nick Blendy	MTA
Rich Vetter	MTA
Jennifer Holl	MTA
Katie Post	MTA

The purpose of this meeting was to field view the architectural resources within the study area for Route 24 and Route 54 Improvements Projects and discuss the preliminary eligibility recommendations. (Note: Map numbers refer to the numbers assigned to the properties for *the Field Summary and Preliminary Eligibility Recommendations* packet dated March 2003 for each of the projects)

The field view commenced at the western terminus of the Route 54 project area.

1. Jennifer Holl and Katie Post asked Gwen Davis whether the new CRS forms require photos of each façade of every outbuilding, or if it is appropriate to enter "not visible" on the CRS form. Gwen asked that MTA email her the question and she would forward it to Robin Bodo.
2. A question was raised as to the limits of construction in this area and whether the APE went beyond the project limits. After discussion, it was decided that the properties west of Zion Church Road (Texaco intersection) were outside of the limits of work. This includes tax parcel 5-33-19-45 (Sound Methodist Church and its parsonage/Sunday school - Map Number 1) and 5-33-19-16 (Map Number 2). These resources will be given CRS numbers and any survey material completed thus far will be turned in to the SHPO; however, they will not be included in the Determination of Eligibility Report for the project, but noted in the methodology section.

3. Gwen Davis asked that MTA look at tax parcel 5-33-12-78 (Map Number 7) and 5-33-19-94 (S-2089 – Map Number 8) as possible agricultural complexes due to the extant outbuildings.
4. Gwen Davis and Ann McCleave suggested looking at the interior architecture of 5-33-12-88 (Map Number 9) to assess its eligibility within the bungalow context. They indicated that this resource might be unusual or just a modified bungalow type with one-over-one windows and non-exposed rafters.
5. Mike Hahn noted that he has a subdivision plan depicting several houses along the south side of Route 54 (5-33-12-95, 5-33-12.19-1 to 5-33-12.19-12 - Map Numbers 10-18). This subdivision plan shows that these houses do not meet the 50-year criteria. Mike said he would send this mapping to MTA.*
6. Gwen Davis asked that MTA assign a new CRS number to tax parcel 5-33-12-92 (Map Number 19). The current CRS number S-2086 was assigned to a structure on the property that is no longer extant.
7. Gwen Davis suggested that MTA do further research on tax parcel number 5-33-19-24.01 (S-2091 – Map Number 24), as it may have been a school or other public building at one time.
8. Gwen Davis suggested reassessing the eligibility recommendation on tax parcel 5-33-19-27 (S-2097 – Map Number 26). She asked that MTA try to pinpoint the date of construction and an architect/builder if possible, in addition to any alterations.
9. Gwen Davis agreed that the properties at 5-33-19-25, 5-33-20-2, and 5-33-20-3 (Map Number 25) should probably be evaluated as a complex. However, she asked that MTA research the connection between the properties, i.e. same family, builder, etc.

The meeting broke for lunch and resumed at the southern terminus of the Route 24 Project area.

1. Jennifer Holl and Katie Post voiced their understanding that no work completed by DelDOT in Summer 2002 (lower portion of Route 24) would be duplicated by MTA. They asked Gwen Davis if this included site plans. Gwen asked MTA to email the question and she would forward it to Robin Bodo for a response. MTA will complete USGS mapping for each of the properties surveyed by DelDOT, in addition to the properties surveyed by MTA.
2. Gwen Davis noted that she wasn't sure that the current National Register Multiple Listing nomination for the Nanticoke Indian Community would be sufficient to assess the residential properties currently proposed as additions to the listing. She agreed that this was a difficult topic and that the SHPO would need to have some in-house discussions to decide how to handle these properties.
3. Gwen Davis suggested that the structures on tax parcels 2-34-17-39, 2-34-17-39.02 and 2-34-17-40 (S-9842 – Map Number 17) be evaluated separately, even though they are under the same ownership because they are not from the same period of significance (one structure does not meet the 50 year criteria). She also noted that eligibility under Criterion B for the Burton family connection would need to be significant because there are many Burtons associated with this area of Sussex County, and not all of them are prominent figures.



4. Gwen Davis agreed that the property at tax parcel 2-34-23-262 (S-9845 – Map Number 20), which may be part of the Nanticoke Indian Community Multiple Listing (pending SHPO discussions regarding the nomination), should also be evaluated under Criterion C for its architecture.
5. A question was raised as to the limits of construction in this area of the Route 24 Project and whether the APE went beyond the project limits. After discussion, it was decided that the resource on tax parcel 3-34-18-37.03 (Map Number 25) would be the first property in the APE. The resources at tax parcels 3-34-18-12, 3-34-18-32, 3-34-18-35, 3-34-18-36 (Map Numbers 21-24) and the bridge over Love Creek (S-8359) will be assigned CRS numbers and any survey work completed thus far will be submitted to the SHPO, however, these properties will not be evaluated in the Determination of Eligibility report for this project.
6. Mike Hahn asked if there is any connection between tax parcel 3-34-18-4 and 3-34-18-40.02 (S-1003 and S-1005 – Map Numbers 26 and 29) (i.e. tenant farming). Jennifer Holl responded that no connection had been found, but that MTA would do further research, if necessary.
7. Gwen Davis agreed that tax parcel 3-34-18-39 (S-1004 – Map Number 28) is outside the APE for this project.
8. All agreed that the structure at 3-34-12-46.01 (S-1006 – Map Number 39) is no longer extant.

Gwen Davis stated that the Route 26 context (with property types) should be completed prior to the submission of the Route 24 and Route 54 reports, as the anticipated property types and regional historic context are similar for all three projects. Currently, a meeting is scheduled to discuss the Route 26 Project on May 13, 2003 with DE SHPO, DelDOT and MTA. Where applicable, historic contexts and property types from the Route 26 Project will be used in evaluating the resources for the Route 24 and Route 54 areas. Consensus on the Route 26 context will help to expedite the completion of the Route 24 and Route 54 reports.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:

McCORMICK, TAYLOR & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Katie Post

Research Assistant

cc: All Attendees
Robin Bodo, DE SHPO
Ted Foglietta, MTA
Francine Arnold, MTA